

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO**

ROBERTO RAMOS VÁZQUEZ, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TRIPLE-S SALUD, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL NO.: 19-1527 (SCC)

ORDER

On December 13, 2024, defendants Urologics, LLC, Urologist, LLC and Dr. Héctor Rodríguez Blázquez (collectively, the “Urologics Defendants”) and Triple-S Salud, Inc. (“Triple-S”) (collectively, “Defendants”) filed a motion to compel and for sanctions against Plaintiffs regarding disclosure of patient information and medical records. ECF No. 173. Plaintiffs filed a response in opposition on January 10, 2025. ECF No. 192. For the following reasons, Defendants’ motion to compel and for sanctions (ECF No.173) is deemed MOOT in part and DENIED in part.

In their motion to compel, Defendants request that Plaintiffs be compelled to produce complete patient records and that Defendants be allowed to depose the newly identified persons with knowledge. ECF No. 173. According to Plaintiffs’ response in opposition, the parties have agreed for the patient records to be produced on or before January 24, 2025. ECF No. 192 at 2-3. Therefore, Defendants’ motion to compel is moot as it relates to production of patient records.

The only outstanding issue is whether the Court should allow Defendants to depose the patients identified in the aforementioned patient records. On September 11, 2023, Urologic Defendants filed their first motion to compel in this case. ECF No. 127. Said motion to compel concerned incomplete responses and limited production from Plaintiffs. *Id.* As a result, Urologic

Defendants claim that they were “unable to take any meaningful depositions” in the case. *Id.* at 24. Plaintiffs and Defendants filed a joint motion requesting an extension of the then October 19, 2023 deadline to complete fact witness depositions. ECF No. 130. The Court granted in part and denied in part said motion, extending the deadline to complete fact witness depositions until October 31, 2024. ECF No. 158. The Court warned that all other deadlines – regardless of whether they have expired or not – remained unaltered. *Id.* Neither party requested any additional extension as to fact witness depositions. Thus, the deadline to complete fact witness depositions elapsed on October 31, 2024. Furthermore, the Court ordered the parties to submit a joint proposed timetable as to *only the remaining deadlines*, which did not include the already elapsed fact witness deposition deadline. ECF No. 184 at 4. The need for such an extension was neither discussed at the December 18, 2024 hearing, nor brought to the Court’s attention in any other motion before said deadline elapsed. Therefore, Defendants’ motion to compel is denied as it relates to the taking of additional fact witness depositions.

Accordingly, Urologic Defendants’ motion to compel (ECF No. 173) is MOOT in part and DENIED in part.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

In San Juan, Puerto Rico, this 21st day of January, 2025.

s/Marcos E. López
U.S. Magistrate Judge